

N 305.4 935.356

THE NEW MIDDLE AGES

BONNIE WHEELER
Series Editor

The New Middle Ages presents transdisciplinary studies of medieval cultures. It includes both scholarly monographs and essay collections.

Published by Garland Publishing, Inc.:

Clothes Make the Man: Female Cross Dressing in Medieval Europe
by Valerie R. Hotchkiss (1996)

Medieval Mothering

edited by John Carmi Parsons and Bonnie Wheeler (1996)

Fresh Verdicts on Joan of Arc

edited by Bonnie Wheeler and Charles T. Wood (1996)

Becoming Male in the Middle Ages

edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen and Bonnie Wheeler (1997)

Love for Sale: Materialist Readings of the Troubadour Razo Corpus

by William B. Burgwinkle (1997)

Published by St. Martin's Press:

Women in the Medieval Islamic World: Power, Patronage, and Piety

edited by Gavin R.G. Hambly (1998)

Women in the Medieval
Islamic World
Power, Patronage, and Piety

EDITED BY

GAVIN R.G. HAMBLY

Peter Jackson
"Lultan Ladyyya"
Gint I Ostinish

ST. MARTIN'S PRESS
NEW YORK



SULTĀN RADIYYA BINT ILTUTMISH

Peter Jackson

Although some medieval Muslim women exercised political power behind the scenes, Rāḍiyya bint Iltutmish was one of the few who dared to stand forth as actual ruler.

When Shajarat al-Durr, the favorite wife of the late Sultān al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, was proclaimed sultān of Egypt following the murder of the Sultān's son and successor, Tūrān Shāh, in 648/1250, the chronicler Ibn Wāṣil observed that the enthronement of a woman was without precedent in the Islamic world: there had been female regents recently in Aleppo, but they had not enjoyed the privilege of being named in the Friday prayers [*khutba*].¹ Yet Ibn Wāṣil was mistaken. Half a generation earlier, the princess Rāḍiyya bint Iltutmish had reigned for three years or more (634–37/1236–40) as sultān of Delhi.² It is noteworthy that like Shajarat al-Durr, whose enthronement would be the work of the Turkish slave [Ar. *mamlūk*, *ghulām*; Pers. *bandā*] commanders of her late husband al-Ṣāliḥ Ayyūb, Rāḍiyya was brought to power by the Turkish slave officers of her father Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish.³

At Iltutmish's death in 633/1236, the aristocracy of the Delhi Sultānate comprised a motley assemblage of Ghūrī and other Tājik (*i.e.*, non-Turkish) warriors and bureaucrats, amirs of the *Khalaḥ* (a people of Turkish, or at least Turkicized, stock whose homeland lay in the southern parts of modern Afghanistan), Turkish leaders of free status from *Khwārazm* and Transoxiana, and Turkish slave officers of the late sultān. Many of those in the former categories had fled into India during the invasion of Central Asia and the Iranian world by the Mongols under Čingiz Khān; but the Mongol campaigns were also responsible for an increase in the availability of slaves from among the Turkish tribes of the Caspian and Pontic

steppes, particularly Ilutmish's own people, the Öberli.⁴ Although Ilutmish had built up a corps of *ghulāms* (known, from the sultan's own *laqab*, as *Shamsis*), promoting a few of them to the new dignity of *khān*, the evidence suggests that he had maintained a balance among the different elements within the ranks of the élite.⁵ After his death, claims the later historian Diyā' Baranī (c. 758/1357), his slaves profited from the weakness of Ilutmish's successors to eliminate their competitors.⁶ The climax of this process was the transfer of the sovereignty in 664/1266 from Ilutmish's family, whom, for convenience, we may call the *Shamsids*, to Balabān-i Khwurd [the Lesser], himself an Öberli *ghulām* of Ilutmish and the founder of a new dynasty.

Our source material for Rādiyya's reign is fairly restricted. An early eighth/fourteenth-century chronicle from Baghdad, the *Hawādith al-jāmi'a*, ascribed (probably in error) to Ibn al-Fuwārī, furnishes a brief notice of Ilutmish's death, the reign of his son Firūz Shāh and Rādiyya's accession in the year 635/1237–38.⁷ For an identical passage (though omitting the date) Ibn Abī'l-Faḍāl, a Coptic chronicler of the mid-eighth/fourteenth century, cites a now lost section of the *Ta'rikh Baghrād* of Ibn al-Sā'ī (d. 674/1276),⁸ who is therefore in all probability the author of the *Hawādith* also. Ibn al-Sā'ī may well have derived his information from the caliphal envoy Ṣaghānī, who had brought Ilutmish a diploma [*manshūr*] and a standard from the 'Abbāsīd court in 626/1229, and who is known to have arrived back in Baghdad in 637/1239–40.⁹ But after this date, accurate information on the Sultānate suddenly seems to stop being transmitted westwards, and the perspective on Delhi from elsewhere in the Islamic world is somewhat hazier. It is noteworthy that the list of Delhi Sultāns transmitted by the Ilkhānid chronicler Waṣṣāf, writing in c. 702/1303, and by Ibn Abī'l-Faḍāl himself omits Rādiyya's two immediate successors, Mu'izz al-Dīn Bahām Shāh (r. 637–39/1240–42) and 'Alā' al-Dīn Mas'ūd Shāh (r. 639–44/1242–46), and leaps from Rādiyya to the relatively long reign of her youngest brother Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh (r. 644–64/1246–66).¹⁰ But perhaps we should not read too much into this. The version of the Sultānate's history picked up by the Moroccan traveller Ibn Baṭṭūta, who spent some time in Delhi from 734/1333 onwards, contains an identical *lacuna*.¹¹ The omission of Rādiyya's two successors may merely reflect, after all, the impact that a female sultān had on people in different parts of the *dār al-Islām*.

The only contemporary source for this era in which Turkish *ghulāms* gained ascendancy is a chronicle composed at Delhi. The *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī* of the Ghūrī Minhāj-i Sirāj Jūzjānī, completed in 658/1260, is a general history of the eastern Islamic world, divided into twenty-three sections [*ṭabaqāt*], of which the final three are devoted respectively to the reigns of Ilutmish and his successors (21), the biographies of twenty-five *Shamsī ghulām* commanders (22), and the Mongol irruption into the lands of Islam (23). The history is dedicated to the reigning sultān, Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Ilutmish, and to Balabān, his deputy [*nā'ib*]. Although greatly superior to Baranī's work in its attention to detail, the *Ṭabaqāt* lacks the later chronicler's analytical quality. Jūzjānī's practice, moreover, is often to defer what were clearly important events from *ṭabaqa* 21 for notice in one of the biographies in *ṭabaqa* 22, and to describe the same episode in markedly distinct terms in different *ṭabaqāt*. Combined with a marked tendency to be merely allusive, this often serves to obfuscate important developments. A case in point is Ilutmish's designation of a successor.

Ilutmish's eldest son, Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd, who had been widely expected to succeed him, died prematurely in 626/1229;¹² and it was the next son, Rukn al-Dīn Firūz Shāh, who ascended the throne within a few days of his father's death on 20 Shā'ban 633/29 April 1236. Following an expedition to Gwāliyōr in 630/1233, Firūz Shāh had been granted the *iqṭā'* of Lahore, at one time held by Nāṣir al-Dīn Maḥmūd. The impression that he was being groomed for the succession is fostered by the fact that he accompanied Ilutmish back to Delhi during the sultān's final illness; and Jūzjānī confirms that the eyes of the people were on the prince.¹³ A work composed in Ilutmish's last years is dedicated to the sultān and Firūz Shāh jointly, as if the latter were heir-apparent.¹⁴ All this seems fairly conclusive. But at another juncture Jūzjānī claims that in the wake of the Gwāliyōr expedition Ilutmish had marked out for the succession Rādiyya, who was his eldest daughter (and hence possibly his firstborn child) and whose mother was his chief wife, and had even caused a diploma to be drawn up naming her as the next sultān. When certain officials objected, he allegedly predicted that none of his sons would be found worthy of the sovereignty.¹⁵ We must bear in mind, however, that Jūzjānī had been left at Gwāliyōr and did not return to Delhi until 635/1238 (i.e., during Rādiyya's own reign).¹⁶

he could not have witnessed this episode, and indeed he does not claim to have seen the diploma for Rāḍiyya. In these circumstances, we have to consider the possibility that the story is apocryphal and was put about by those who made her sultān. Given its disparagement of the Shamsid princes (including the reigning sultān, Naṣir al-Dīn Mahmūd Shāh),¹⁷ of course, the tale could have acquired a new significance at the time Jūzjānī was writing, when the replacement of Ilutmish's dynasty may already have been on the horizon.

During Firūz Shāh's brief reign, effective control of affairs was abandoned to his mother Shāh Terken, who seized the opportunity to pay off old scores in the *ḥaram*, blinded and then put to death one of the sultān's half-brothers, and later sought to kill Rāḍiyya in turn. These actions seem to have provoked widespread revolts.¹⁸ One rising, in Awadh, was led by another brother, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad. A second comprised a number of Ilutmish's senior *amīrs*, notably the *ghulām* Kabīr Khān Ayāz, who had been in the late sultān's service from an early date;¹⁹ the free Turkish *amīr* 'Alā' al-Dīn Jānī, bombastically described by Jūzjānī as 'prince of Turkistān';²⁰ and 'Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Sālārī, probably a Ghūrī, who held the *iqṭā'* of Badā'ūn; while the *wazīr* Junaydī deserted Firūz Shāh's encampment to join them. The relationship, if any, between this insurrection and the activities of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad is unclear. Some of these *amīrs* may have had other motives for rebellion: it is possibly significant that both Kabīr Khān and Jānī had suffered a fall from favor in the last years of the previous reign, and that Sālārī, who under Ilutmish had occupied the important post of military chamberlain [*amīr-i ḥājib*], is not so described in Firūz Shāh's era.²¹ Nor were Kabīr Khān and his allies satisfied by a change of regime at Delhi. Even when Shāh Terken was overthrown in Delhi by yet another faction, and Firūz Shāh himself was arrested and put to death on 18 Rabi' I 634/19 November 1236, the insurgent *amīrs* refused to recognize Rāḍiyya, who had been enthroned in his place, and besieged her in the capital. The new sultān eventually won over Sālārī and Kabīr Khān, and the rebellion collapsed: the *wazīr* Junaydī ended his days as a fugitive in the Sirmūr region of the sub-Himalaya.²²

Firūz Shāh's enthronement appears to have been the work of the great *amīrs*, provincial governors and *iqṭā'*-holders [*muqṭa's*] who were temporarily in Delhi, having accompanied Ilutmish back to

the capital from his last campaign.²³ By contrast, Rāḍiyya's support came from two quarters: the citizens of Delhi, who brought down Shāh Terken, and the Shamsī *ghulāms*, who put Rāḍiyya on the throne. A century later Ibn Baṭṭūṭa would hear how Rāḍiyya appeared on the terrace of the royal palace [*darulakhāna*] and how the people rose in response to her impassioned appeal to her father's memory. Jūzjānī's more sober account says simply that they revolted and stormed the palace [*qasr*] when Shāh Terken attempted to arrest the princess.²⁴ Rāḍiyya would continue to enjoy the support of Delhi's citizens, both during its investment by the rebel *amīrs*²⁵ and later, when her enemies had to lure her out of the capital in order to encompass her deposition (see below).

But those chiefly instrumental in Rāḍiyya's enthronement were Ilutmish's slave officers, who at this juncture first surface as an identifiable force in the politics of the Sultānate. A group described by Jūzjānī as *turkān-i ḥaḍrat* [the Turks of the court, or 'the capital'], had manifested their disenchantment with Firūz Shāh at an early stage by leaving Delhi for Hindūstān, conceivably in a bid to join his brother in Awadh, but they were brought back; among them was Balaban 'the Lesser,' who underwent a brief spell of imprisonment.²⁶ When Firūz Shāh moved against Kabīr Khān and his confederates at Kuhrām [Ghurām], 'the Turkish *amīrs* and personal slaves who were serving in the center' [*umarā-yi turk-u bandagān-i khāss ki dar khidmat-i qalb būdand*] mutinied at Tarā'in and put to death several Tājik bureaucrats, including a son of the *wazīr* Junaydī. And when the sultān turned back for the capital on the news of his mother's downfall, it was these same officers, called now 'the center [consisting] of Turkish *amīrs*' [*qalb-i umarā-yi turk*], who deserted him at Kīlōkhīrī and recognized Rāḍiyya.²⁷ During the siege of Delhi by the rebel *amīrs* Kabīr Khān, Sālārī and Junaydī, against whom her brother had headed his ill-starred expedition, Rāḍiyya was vigorously supported by her father's Turkish *ghulāms* [*umarā-yi turk ki bandagān-i Shamsī būdand*].²⁸ The veteran Shamsī *amīr*, Nuṣrat al-Dīn *Tāisi, on whom Rāḍiyya had conferred Awadh following the sudden (and unexplained) demise of her brother Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad, was on his way to her assistance when he was intercepted by the rebels and died in captivity. Among the defenders of Delhi were two other former slaves of Ilutmish: Ikhtiyār al-Dīn *Altunapa, Ilutmish's chief canopy-bearer [*sar-i čardār*],

and 'Izz al-Dīn Balaban (later to be entitled Kūshlū Khān), who held the *iqṭā'* of Baran and was one of two Turkish commanders known to have been the ringleaders in the *émante* at Tarā'in.²⁹

According to the later author 'Iṣāmī, Firūz Shāh had failed to pay his father's *ghulāms* sufficient attention,³⁰ which doubtless indicates that his government relied excessively on the Tājik officials whom the Shamsis so ruthlessly eliminated. During Radiyya's reign a number of Ilutmish's more junior household *ghulāms* obtained court office for the first time or received their first *iqṭā'*s. Of Balaban 'the Lesser' we are told that at her accession he was still, as he had been under her father, a falconer [*khabārdār*], and that she promoted him to chief huntsman [*amīr-i shikār*].³¹ His brother Sayf al-Dīn Aybeg (the future Kishli Khān), who had simply been serving in the sultan's private household [*khidmat-i dargā-i khabāss mīkard*], became deputy commander of the guard [*nā'ib-i sar-i jāndār*].³² Tāj al-Dīn Sanjar (later Arslan Khān), who had probably been purchased at the same time as Sayf al-Dīn, was like Balaban a falconer; but Radiyya made him cupbearer [*āshnāgar*] and subsequently allotted him the *iqṭā'* of Balāram.³³ *Ghulāms* of a slightly more senior rank were also promoted. Baran was given in *iqṭā'* to *Altunapa.³⁴ Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Aytegin, *muqṭa'* of Kūjah and Nandana, was first transferred to Badā'un and then raised to the pivotal rank of *amīr-hājib*.³⁵ We are surely entitled to see in these appointments—in some cases, the first steps towards power by those who would dominate the 1250s—as a reward for bringing Radiyya to the throne.

But although several Shamsī slaves might thus have identified Radiyya's reign with a turning-point in their fortunes, the sultan nevertheless proved reluctant to rely exclusively on her father's *ghulāms*; and if her backers had expected her to remain in the shadows, they were to be disappointed. The rank of deputy commander-in-chief [*nā'ib-i lasghar*] had been bestowed on a Turkish officer, Sayf al-Dīn Aybeg-i *Totaq, with the title of Qutluḡ Khān. On his death in 635/1237–38, however, the post was given not to a Turk but to the Ghūrī *malik* Qutb al-Dīn Ḥasan b. 'Alī.³⁶ In 636/1238–39, moreover, Radiyya took the *iqṭā'* of Baran from Tāj al-Dīn Sanjar-i Qabaqulaq, who had replaced *Altunapa when the latter was sent to command the crown fortress of Tabarhindh, and bestowed it on a son of Ḥasan Qarluq, the Khwarazmian ruler of Binbān, whom she had welcomed at her

court.³⁷ The transfer of *iqṭā'*s in this fashion was an obvious device to prevent the formation of local ties on the part of the grantees, and hence an important instrument of royal authority; it appeared all the more alarming, however, when the beneficiary happened to be an outsider. It has become obligatory at this juncture to exonerate Radiyya from the charge of improper relations with a different kind of outsider, the African [*Ḥabashī*] slave *amīr* Jamāl al-Dīn Yāqūt, which was current when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa visited Delhi a century later but which is unsupported by contemporary evidence.³⁸ But the question is irrelevant. What mattered was that Radiyya sought to develop a power-base of her own and neglected the Turkish slave élite which she and Firūz Shāh had inherited from their father. Her dependence on Yāqūt and his promotion to the rank of intendant of the imperial stables [*amīr-i ākkār*] must be seen in this context. It is alleged not only to have offended the *amīr-hājib* Aytegin in particular but to have aroused the resentment of Turks, Ghūris, and Tājiks alike.³⁹ Radiyya's coinage, too, seems to testify to her emancipation. Initially coins struck at Delhi reflected the vulnerability of her regime, since they bore either her father's name alone or proclaimed Ilutmish as *Sulṭān al-'Azam* with Radiyya herself given the subordinate title of *Sulṭān al-Mu'azzam*. But the style changed, possibly again in 635/1237–38, when Radiyya alone was named on the coinage.⁴⁰

Jūzjānī claims that the power of the Delhi state was extended under Radiyya, who was acknowledged "from the territory of Lakhnawī [western Bengal] as far as Diwal and Damīla [lower Sind]."⁴¹ In Sind royal authority does appear to have been reasserted. Here the news of Ilutmish's death had provoked an attack on Uchch by Ḥasan Qarluq's forces, which was beaten off by the *muqṭa'*, Sayf al-Dīn Aybeg. Aybeg then, in Jūzjānī's obscure phrasing, "grew powerful," possibly implying that he considered declaring his independence of Delhi. But he died in an accident shortly afterwards, and the next *muqṭa'* of Uchch, Hindū Khān, was Radiyya's appointee and was removed, significantly, only after her downfall.⁴² In the east, however, Radiyya's reign may have witnessed a decline in the authority of the center. To secure the allegiance of the *muqṭa'* of Lakhnawī, Toghān Khān, she felt obliged to confer on him a standard and a ceremonial parasol [*čatr*], and thereby virtually conceded his autonomy.⁴³

There are signs, moreover, that in her dealings with independent Hindu powers Rāḍiyya espoused retrenchment. Immediately following his appointment as *nā'ib-i lashgar* in 635/1238, Qurb al-Dīn Ḥasan was despatched to Ranthambōr, which had been under siege by the independent Chauhāns for some time. The Muslim garrison was evacuated and the fortifications were destroyed.⁴⁴ In Shā'ban of the same year, March–April 1238, forces under Sanjar-i Qabāqulaq, the *muqta'* of Baran, moved to Gwāliyūr. One motive for this expedition may possibly have been to remove the castellan [*kāwā'il*], who seems from his *nisba* to have been a kinsman of the fallen *warzūr* Junaydī. But it looks as if here too the garrison and the Muslim populace, including the chronicler Jūzjānī, who had been *qāḍī* of Gwāliyūr since its capture in 630/1233, were evacuated and escorted back to Delhi.⁴⁵ Although Jūzjānī's office of *qāḍī* was renewed, he was simultaneously given another position in the capital, which suggests that the Gwāliyūr post was *in partibus infidelium*. And later in the reign we find Temūr Khān, who held the *iqṭā'* of Qinnawj, heading a campaign "towards Gwāliyūr and Mālwa,"⁴⁶ indicating no doubt that the fortress had passed back into Hindu hands. Both Ranthambōr and Gwāliyūr represented major conquests from the reign of the sultān's revered father Ilutmuṣh,⁴⁷ and their loss will hardly have endeared her to his old *ghulāms*.

In these circumstances, and faced with the distressing signs of autonomy mentioned above, the *amīrs* grew restive. In 636/1238–39 Kabīr Khān, whose betrayal of his fellow-rebels had been rewarded with 'Alā' al-Dīn Jānī's *iqṭā'* of Lahore, rose in revolt there, but when in the following year the sultān in person moved against him, he was unable to retreat beyond the Chenāb and yielded. Rāḍiyya treated him leniently, merely compelling him to exchange *iqṭā'*s with Qaraqush Khān, who had hitherto held Multān.⁴⁸ A more widespread conspiracy, however, was successful. The sultān was lured away from Delhi, where she was popular, by a rising at Tabarhindh, where *Altunapa was in secret contact with the *amīr-hājib* Aytegin at court; Yāqūt was seized and put to death while the army was on the march, and Rāḍiyya was incarcerated at Tabarhindh.⁴⁹ With the enthronement of one of her half-brothers as Mu'izz al-Dīn Bahrām Shāh on 27 Ramaḍān 637/21 April 1240, the *amīrs* took steps to secure a tighter grip on the government. Significantly, they gave their allegiance [*bay'at*] to Bahrām Shāh only when he had

agreed to the creation of the new office of 'viceroys' [*nā'ib*], which went to the *amīr-hājib* Aytegin.⁵⁰

Although Aytegin was intended to act for just one year in view of the sultān's youth, he soon aroused the new sovereign's resentment, securing Bahrām Shāh's sister in marriage and arrogating to himself imperial prerogatives. He was murdered on the sultān's orders on 8 Muharram 638/30 July 1240, and the office of *nā'ib* lapsed.⁵¹ This provoked an unsuccessful bid to restore Rāḍiyya, whose jailer *Altunapa reacted to the elimination of his ally Aytegin by releasing and marrying his prisoner.⁵² Sālārī and Qaraqush Khān are alleged to have rallied to Rāḍiyya's cause; but it is unclear whether they took part in the ensuing engagement. Near Tarā'in, in the very region where in 587/1192 the Muslim forces had won the victory that gave them Delhi and where in 612/1216 her father Ilutmuṣh had secured his precarious throne by overthrowing his overlord Tāj al-Dīn Yildiz, Rāḍiyya and her husband, at the head of an army that included contingents from the Hindu tribes of the eastern Panjāb, were routed by the imperial army under Bahrām Shāh in person on 24 Rabī' I 638/13 October 1240. Shortly afterwards the couple were killed by Hindus while fleeing through the neighbourhood of Kaithal.⁵³

Both Shajarat al-Durr and Rāḍiyya owed their position in part to Turkish slave officers, first-generation converts from the steppe, who originated in a society where women enjoyed a wider latitude.⁵⁴ Jūzjānī notices that Rāḍiyya discarded her female attire, emerged from purdah, and allowed herself to be seen in public riding on an elephant.⁵⁵ But however scandalous this might have been to the Tājik *'ulamā'* of Delhi, it would surely have had less impact on the Turkish military. Although this is not the place to consider the persistence of non-Islamic attitudes within medieval Turkish Muslim societies,⁵⁶ it is worth noting that in the following century Ibn Batrūta, recalling his journey among the nomads of the Pontic steppes, would comment on the greater freedom of Turkish women (including Muslim women), relative to those in the rest of Islamic society, and would observe that they did not wear the veil.⁵⁷ If we move from these relaxed attitudes, however, to the incidence of female sovereigns, the evidence tends to come not from the Turkish peoples, but from the Mongol-type peoples of the eastern steppes. On two occasions in the middle decades of the sixth/twelfth century, princesses ruled over the Qara-Khitān empire in Turkestan—itsself

founded by refugees from the Khitan [Liao] dynasty of northern China, who are generally regarded as being of proto-Mongol stock—with powers that seem to have amounted to more than merely those of a regent.⁵⁸ Now a number of Iluttmish's *ghulāms*—Ayregin and Qaraqush Khān for instance—were of Khitan or Qara-Khitan stock and may have been influenced by such precedents in their homeland.⁵⁹ But it should also be borne in mind that other peoples from whom Iluttmish drew his slave officers belonged themselves to 'Mongol' ethnic groups. The term 'Qipčaq' embraced a great many tribal groups between the Dnieper and the Irtys, of whom some are known—like Iluttmish's own tribe, the Ölberli—to have dwelt at an earlier date in the eastern steppes.⁶⁰ One such group—the Bayaut branch of the Kimek [Yemek] people, whose pasturelands lay somewhere to the north of the Aral Sea and the Sir-darya—had produced Terken Khātūn, the mother of the Khwārazmshāh Muḥammad, who until the Mongol conquest in 618/1221 ruled Khwārazm in virtual independence of her son, with the support of troops drawn from her own tribe.⁶¹

Radiyya may also have enjoyed a claim to legitimacy in the eyes of the Turks as Iluttmish's eldest child. Loyalty to the memory of their master was strong among his Turkish *ghulāms*. In the wake of Bahram Shāh's overthrow in 639/1242, when the Shamsi slave 'Izz al-Dīn Balaban (shortly to receive the style of Kūshlū Khān) made a bid for the throne, he was frustrated by a group of his colleagues, who assembled at Iluttmish's grave.⁶² It may be surmised that Radiyya had similarly provided a focus for such loyalty in 634/1236 and that she continued to do so even after her deposition and death, particularly since the Turkish *ghulām* élite came to enjoy a far more fraught relationship with her successor and her reign may accordingly have taken on the color of a golden age. Jūzjānī, writing in part for his benefactor Balaban, who—it should be recalled—had obtained his first important office during Radiyya's reign, does not hesitate to praise her qualities as a ruler, imputing to her the sole defect that she was not a man: it is striking that she is the only one of Iluttmish's dynasty whom he credits with being a war-leader [*azbgar-kash*].⁶³ The fact that her tomb near Delhi had become a place of pilgrimage by the time Ibn Baṭṭūṭa visited India⁶⁴ may testify less to the abiding respect in which she was held by the citizens of the capital than to

the efforts of successive governments to harness such sentiments to their own purposes.⁶⁵

Radiyya's reign did not mark a transition, as did that of Shajarat al-Durr, between the era of a non-Turkish ruling dynasty and a Mamlūk regime.⁶⁶ Unlike the Ayyubids, Iluttmish himself had been a Turkish slave, and his *ghulāms* continued to jostle for power with Tajik and Ghūrī *amīrs* for some decades after Radiyya's overthrow. Nor did they ever succeed in monopolizing the principal offices of state as did their confrères in Egypt; there would be many reverses along the way before one of their number displaced the Shamsid dynasty and ascended the throne. Yet the period of Radiyya's rule did witness a major landmark in this process. If the *ghulāms* did not acquire a dangerous preponderance in the ranks of the élite, their heyday began with Radiyya. The intrusion of a greater number of Turkish slave commanders into *iqṭās* and the higher offices constitutes a half-way house between the first promotions under Iluttmish and the creation of the post of *nā'ib* at the accession of her brother Bahram Shāh. That Radiyya, having contributed to the advancement of the Turkish *ghulāms*, then attempted vigorously (albeit unavailingly) to check them by forming an alternative power-base is perhaps irrelevant; though it gives the lie to Barani's generalizations, noted above, about the feebleness of Iluttmish's dynasty.

NOTES

1. Ibn Wāṣil, *Mufaṣṣij al-Kurūb fī Akhbār Banī Ayyūb*, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, ms. arabe 1702, fol. 372v; trans. in Francesco Gabrieli, *Arab Historians of the Crusades* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), p. 298. In this essay, an asterisk (*) is used to indicate that we cannot be certain how to reconstruct the proper name in question.
2. For her reign, see generally A.B.M. Habibullah, *The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India*, 2nd ed. (Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1961), pp. 116–22; idem, "Sultānah Raziah" [sic], *Indian Historical Quarterly* 16 (1940): 750–72; Mohammad Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, eds., *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, *A Comprehensive History of India* 5 (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1970), pp. 237–44.
3. That both women were installed by Turks is noticed in Fatima Mernissi, *The Forgotten Queens of Islam*, trans. Mary Jo Lakeland (Cambridge, Eng.: Polity Press, 1993), see pp. 89–99. For Shajarat al-Durr, see further Götz Schlegel, *Die Sulthanin von Ägypten. Sāḡarat ad-Durr in der arabischen*

Geschichtsschreibung und Literatur (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961), pp. 59–61.

4. Thomas T. Allsen, "Prelude to the Western campaigns: Mongol Military Operations in the Volga-Ural Region, 1217–37," *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 3 (1983): 16; Peter B. Golden, "Cumanica II. The Ölberli (Ölperl): The Fortunes and Misfortunes of an Inner Asian Nomadic Clan," *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 6 (1986 [1988]): 26–28. The name of this tribe, which is given as LBRY by Jüzjānī, usually therefore appears as 'Ibarī' in secondary works on Indian history.

5. Irfan Habib, "Formation of the Sultanate Ruling Class of the Thirteenth Century," in Habib, ed., *Medieval India 1: Researches in the History of India 1200–1750* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 9–15.

6. Baranī, *Tārīkh-i Firūz-Shāhī*, ed. Saiyid Ahmad Khān (Calcutta: Bibliotheca Indica, 1861–2), pp. 27–28: for a translation of the relevant passage, see Habib, "Formation," pp. 15–16. On the Turkish *ghulām*s in India, see more generally Gavin Hambly, "Who Were the Chihilgānī, the Forty Slaves of Sultan Shams al-Dīn Ilutmish of Delhi?" *Iran* 10 (1972): 57–62; Peter Jackson, "The Mamlūk Institution in Early Muslim India," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1990): 340–58.

7. *Ḥawāṣṣ al-Jāmi'a*, ed. Muṣṭafā Jawād (Baghdad, 1351/1932), p. 104.

8. Ibn Abī'l-Faḍā'il, *al-Nahj al-Sādīd*, ed. and trans. Samira Kortanamer, *Ägypten und Syrien zwischen 1317 und 1341 in der Chronik des Muṣṭafād b. Abī'l-Faḍā'il*, Islamkundliche Untersuchungen 23 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Klaus Schwarz, 1973). Arabic text pp. 28–29 (German trans., p. 107).

9. Khaliḥ b. Aḥbak al-Safādī, *al-Waḥī bi'l-Wafāyāt*, ed. Helmut Ritter et al., 12, Bibliotheca Islamica 61 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1979), p. 241.

10. Waṣṣāfī, *Tarjūyat al-Amṣār wa-Tarjūyat al-Aṣṣār*, lithograph ed. (Bombay, 1269/1853), p. 310; hence *Die Indiensgeschichte des Raṣīd ad-Dīn*, ed. and trans. Karl Jahn (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, Denkschriften 144, 1980), Persian text Tafel 22, Arabic text Tafel 57 (German trans., p. 48). Ibn Abī'l-Faḍā'il, Arabic text pp. 28–29 (German trans., p. 107).

11. Ibn Baṭṭūta, *Tuhfat al-Nuẓẓār*, ed. Ch. Defrémery and B.R. Sanguinetti, 4 vols. (Paris: Société Asiatique, 1853–58), vol. 3, pp. 167–69, and idem, *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūta A.D. 1325–1354*, 4 vols. thus far with continuous pagination, trans. I.I.A.R. Gibb, Hakluyt Society, 2nd series, 110, 117, 141, 178 (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1958–94), vol. 3, pp. 631–32.

12. Jüzjānī, *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī*, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥayy Ḥabībī, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Kabul, 1342–43 SH/1963–64), vol. 1, p. 447, and idem, *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī: A General History of the Muhammadan Dynasties of Asia*, 2 vols. with continuous pagination, trans. H.G. Raverty (Calcutta: Bibliotheca Indica, 1872–81), vol. 1, pp. 616–17.

13. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 454–55 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 630, 631).

14. Anonymous translation of Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī's *Sirr al-Makhtūma*, Paris, BN ms. supp. persan 384, fol. 2r.

15. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 458 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 638–39); we are told at vol. 1, p. 456 (trans. p. 635), that Rāḍiyya was his eldest daughter. Nizāmī (in Habib and Nizami, *The Delhi Sultanat*, pp. 230–31) believes that Ilutmish originally designated Rāḍiyya, but then changed his mind and groomed Firūz Shāh instead. Similarly Habibullah, *The Foundation*, p. 115, sees Firūz Shāh's enthronement as "technically a supersession of Rāziah." 16. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 448–49, 460 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 620, 643–44); and see below.

17. As Nizami points out, in Habib and Nizami, *The Delhi Sultanat*, pp. 230–31, n. 84; cf. also his *On History and Historians of Medieval India* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983), p. 84. It is unfortunate that Nizami's insight is undermined in *The Delhi Sultanat*, pp. 253, 256, by his assertion, on the less reliable testimony of the mid-eighteenth-century author 'Iṣāmī, that Maḥmūd Shāh was not Ilutmish's youngest son, born after his namesake's death, as Jüzjānī tells us, but the old sulṭān's grandson.

18. For Shāh Teuken's tyranny and the revolts, see Jüzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 455–56 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 632–34).

19. He was purchased from the heirs of Naṣir al-Dīn Ḥusayn, chief huntsman [*amīr-i ṣaykān*] to Tāj al-Dīn Yildiz of Ghazna, on the former's murder: Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 5 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, pp. 724–25). This event, which coincided with the murder of Yildiz's *wazīr*, can be dated to 611/1214–15: Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 413 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 504–505); Ibn al-Aḥrī, *al-Kāmil fī l-Tārīkh*, ed. C.J. Tornberg, *Ibn al-Aḥrī Chronicon quod perfectissimum scribitur*, 12 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1851–76), vol. 12, p. 199, repr. with different pagination (Beirut: Dar Sader, 1385–87/1965–67), vol. 12, pp. 304–305.

20. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 452 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, p. 626).

21. For Kabir Khān and Jānī, see Jüzjānī, vol. 2, pp. 6, 9 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, pp. 726, 731–32). For Sālārī, see Habib, "Formation," p. 13; also 'Awfī, "Preface," *Jawāmi' al-Ḥikāyāt*, 1, ed. Muḥammad Mu'īn, 2nd ed. (Tehran, 1340 SH/1961), p. 12.

22. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 458–59 (the text reads Sirhind for Sirmūr; but cf. British Library ms. Add. 26189, fol. 182v, and Raverty's trans., vol. 1, pp. 640–41).

23. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 455 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 631–32). Habibullah, "Sultānah Rāziah," p. 757, and *The Foundation*, p. 115.

24. Ibn Baṭṭūta, vol. 3, pp. 166–67 (trans. Gibb, vol. 3, p. 631). Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 456 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 636).

25. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 6 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 726).

26. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, pp. 48–49, 51 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, pp. 802, 805).

27. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 456–57 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 634–35, 636).

28. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 36 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 779). At vol. 1, p. 438, Jüzjānī calls Radiyya's adherents simply *umarā-yi turk*.
29. For *Tāstī, see Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 458, and vol. 2, p. 13 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 639–40; vol. 2, pp. 735–36); the origin of this name is obscure. For *Altunapa, see Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 21 (trans. vol. 2, p. 748, is misleading, since Raverty renders *dar-bandān* as 'imprisonment' rather than 'siege'). The name is spelled 'L'WNYH in the printed text [Raverty's 'Alrūnāh'], but I suspect we have here a form composed of Turkish *altun*, 'golden', and *aba*, 'clan', or *apa*, 'ancestor', and found among the Qipčaq/Polovtsi: *Pol'noe sobranie russikh letopisei, i. Lavrent'evskia letapis'*, 2nd ed. (Leningrad: Akademii Nauk, 1926–28), col. 278; Sir Gerard Clauson, *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), pp. 5, 131. Küsbilü Klān: Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 36 (quoted in Raverty's trans., vol. 2, p. 779): he was briefly taken prisoner by the insurgent *amīrs* while fighting for Radiyya outside the capital.
30. 'Iṣāmī, *Fatūh al-Salātīn*, ed. A.S. Usha (Madras: Madras University Islamic Series, 9, 1948), p. 130, and trans. A. Mahdi Husain, 3 vols. with continuous pagination (Aligarh Muslim University Press: Aligarh, 1967–77), vol. 2, p. 248 (on which n. 1 erroneously cites as examples nobles who were not slaves).
31. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, pp. 48, 51 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, pp. 802, 806). The meaning of *khāqādār* was established by S.H. Hodivala, *Studies in Indo-Muslim History*, 2 vols. (Bombay, 1939–57), vol. 2, pp. 67–68.
32. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 46 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, pp. 797–98).
33. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 34 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, pp. 766–67, reading *jānadar* for *khāqādār*). For the date at which Ilutmish had purchased them, see Jackson, "The *Mamlūk* institution," p. 347 and n. 35.
34. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 21 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 748).
35. Ibid., vol. 1, p. 460, and vol. 2, p. 22 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, p. 642; vol. 2, p. 750). For *ay*, 'moon', and *tegin*, 'prince', see Jean Sauvaget, "Noms et surnoms des Mamelouks," *Journal Asiatique* 238 (1950): 31–58, no. 41.
36. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 459 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 641–42). Sayf al-Dīn's sobriquet, which is given as BFTW in Jābībī's text and 'Bilhaq' by Raverty, appears as ITQ in ms. Add. 26189, fols. 182v, 183r. This looks like the Tu. title *tatāq*, or conceivably a nickname, *tutūq*, 'tongue-tied': Clauson, p. 433; Denis Sinor, "The Turkish title *tutūq* rehabilitated," in *Turica et Orientalia. Studies in Honor of Gunnar Jarring* (Istanbul, 1970–71): 18–19, 119. Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul 1, 1988), pp. 145–48. For his epitaph, from Abūhar, see *Annual Report on Indian Epigraphy* 4 (1970–71): 18–19, 119.
37. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 21 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 748), for *Altunapa; vol. 2, p. 25–26 (trans. vol. 2, p. 754), for Sanjar-i Qabaqulaq; vol. 2, p. 162 (trans. vol. 2, p. 1129), for Hasan Qarluq's son. It is clear from ms. Add. 26189, fol. 186v, that Tāj al-Dīn Sanjar's sobriquet, given as 'Qilquq' by Raverty, is to be read *qabaqulaq*, 'protruding ears': Clauson, pp. 580–81, 621; Jackson, "The *Mamlūk* institution," p. 342, n. 7. On Qarluq's

principality, see Iqtidar Husain Siddiqui, "The Qarluq Kingdom in North-Western India during the Thirteenth Century," *Islamic Culture* 54 (1980): 75–91. Habibullah, in "Sulṭānah Rāziyah," pp. 762–64, speculated that Qarluq was making an unsuccessful bid to involve Radiyya in a joint anti-Mongol front.

38. Ibn Baṭṭūta, vol. 3, p. 167 (trans. Gibb, vol. 3, p. 631). He heard that Yāqūt had been Radiyya's slave. The statement of 'Iṣāmī, p. 134 (trans. Husain, vol. 2, p. 253), that Yāqūt was a slave of Ilutmish and had served both that sulṭān and Firūz Shāh as *amīr-i ākhūn*, was accepted by Habibullah, "Sulṭānah Rāziyah," p. 766; but Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 24 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 752), seems to suggest that Badr al-Dīn Sonqur held this office from Ilutmish's reign into that of Radiyya. See also Habib and Nizami, *The Delhi Sultanat*, p. 240, n. 21.

39. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 460, and vol. 2, pp. 21, 22–23 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 642–43; vol. 2, pp. 748, 750). Habib and Nizami, *The Delhi Sultanat*, pp. 240, 243. Ms. Add. 26189, fol. 183r, gives Yāqūt the title 'chief *amīr*' [*amīr al-umarā*], a phrase omitted in Jābībī's edition of Jüzjānī (vol. 1, p. 460).

40. H. Nelson Wright, *The Coinage and Metrology of the Sulṭāns of Delhi* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. 40 (nos. 161, 161A). Coins struck in distant Lakhnawī carried Radiyya's name alone throughout, apparently, see p. 41 (nos. 161B–61D).

41. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 459 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, p. 641).

42. The phrase *qūi-yi hāl gash*, found in ms. Add. 26189, fol. 199r, is omitted in Jābībī's edition, vol. 2, p. 9, but cf. Raverty's trans. in Jüzjānī, vol. 2, pp. 730–31. Hindū Khān, Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 19 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 746).

43. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 14 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 737). For *toḡlan*, 'falcon,' see Sauvaget, no. 140.

44. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 459–60 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, p. 642).

45. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 460, and vol. 2, pp. 25–26 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 643–44; vol. 2, pp. 754–55). The evacuees included Muslim envoys from the Mongols of the Qipčaq steppe, who were removed to Qinnawj [Kanaui]: ibid., vol. 2, p. 214 (trans. vol. 2, p. 1285, where Raverty's phrase "In the end this sovereign was put in seclusion" is a misunderstanding of Jüzjānī's remarks about the envoys).

46. Jüzjānī, vol. 2, p. 17 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 743).

47. See Jüzjānī's account of the two campaigns: ibid., vol. 1, pp. 445–46, 448–49 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 610–11, 619–21).

48. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 460, and vol. 2, pp. 6, 20 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 644–45; vol. 2, pp. 726–27, 747). For *qaraqul*, 'eagle,' see Clauson, p. 670.

49. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 460–61, and vol. 2, p. 21 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, p. 645, vol. 2, pp. 748–49).

50. Jüzjānī, vol. 1, p. 463 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, p. 649).

51. Jūzjānī, vol. 1, pp. 463–64, and vol. 2, p. 23 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 649–51; vol. 2, p. 751).

52. Professor Nizami (in Habib and Nizami, *The Delhi Sultanat*, p. 242) believes that *Altunapa turned against the new regime because he had been double-crossed by Aytegin; but the chronology suggests, in my view, that he revolted on the news of Aytegin's murder.

53. Jūzjānī, vol. 1, p. 462, and vol. 2, p. 22 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 647–48; vol. 2, p. 749). For the support of the Hindu tribes, see 'Iṣmī, in p. 139 (trans. Husain, vol. 2, p. 259).

54. Schregle, pp. 75–76; see also Golden's comments in "Cumanica II. The Ölberli," p. 27.

55. Jūzjānī, vol. 1, p. 460 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 643–44). This is mentioned also by Ibn Baṭṭūta, vol. 3, p. 167 (trans. Gibb, vol. 3, p. 631).

56. See J.P. Roux, "Recherche des survivances pré-islamiques dans les textes turcs musulmans: le *Bāḥar-Nāme*," *Journal Asiatique* 256 (1968): 247–61, and "Recherche des survivances pré-islamiques dans les textes turcs musulmans: le *Kiṭāb-i Dede Qorqu*," *Journal Asiatique* 264 (1976): 35–55.

57. Ibn Baṭṭūta, vol. 2, pp. 377–79 (trans. Gibb, vol. 2, pp. 480–81); see also vol. 2, p. 384 (trans. Gibb, vol. 2, p. 483), on the public appearances of the wives of the Khān Özbeg.

58. Karl A. Wittfogel and Fêng Chia-shêng, *History of Chinese Society: Liao 907–1125*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new series, 36 [for 1946] (Philadelphia, 1949), pp. 643, 644. 646; see also the remarks about the Liao rulers in China at pp. 199–202. For the role of women in Mongol society, see Paul Ratchnevsky, "La condition de la femme mongole au xii^e/xiii^e siècle," in Walther Heissig et al., eds., *Tractata Alatica Denis Smor... dedicata* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976), pp. 509–30, especially pp. 517–23.

59. Jūzjānī, vol. 2, pp. 19, 22 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, pp. 746, 749). The point was well made by Habibullah, "Sultānah Rāziyah," p. 752; although the examples that follow from the Islamic world (pp. 752–53) include women, like Dayfa Khātūn of Aleppo, who were merely regents.

60. Omdjan Pritsak, "Two migratory movements in the Eurasian steppe in the 9th–11th centuries," in *Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists, New Delhi 1964* 2 (New Delhi, 1968): 157–63. Golden, "Cumanica II. The Ölberli," pp. 10–22.

61. See W. Barthold, *Turkistan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, 3rd ed., ed. C.E. Bosworth, Gibb Memorial Series, new series, 5 (London: Luzac, 1968), pp. 349, 428; Paul Pelliot and Louis Hambis, *Histoire des campagnes de Gengis Khan. Chengé Wan Ts'in-tcheng Lou* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1951), pp. 89–97; her clan may have been linked with the Ölberli (see pp. 107–08). The sources are Juwaynī, *Ta'rikh-i Jahān-Gushā*, ed. Mirzā Muḥammad Qazwīnī, 3 vols, Gibb Memorial Series, 16 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, and London: Luzac, 1912–37), vol. 2, pp. 198–99, and trans. J.A. Boyle, *The History of the World-*

Conqueror, 2 vols. with continuous pagination (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), vol. 2, pp. 465–66; and Nasavī, *Histoire du Sultan Djelal ed-Din Mankobirī*, ed. and trans. Octave Houdas (Paris: École des langues orientales vivantes, 3^e série, 9 and 10, 1891–95), text p. 42, trans. pp. 72–73.

62. Jūzjānī, vol. 2, pp. 36–37 (trans. Raverty, vol. 2, p. 780).

63. Jūzjānī, vol. 1, p. 457 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, pp. 637–38).

64. Ibn Baṭṭūta, vol. 3, p. 169 (trans. Gibb, vol. 3, p. 632). For the tomb, see also Shams-i Sirāj 'Aṭf, *Ta'rikh-i Firūz-Shāhī*, ed. Maulavi Vilayat Husain (Calcutta: Bibliotheca Indica, 1888–91), p. 134. The district was included in the new settlement of Firūzābād founded by Firūz Shāh Tughluq. Rāḍiyā's brothers Rukn al-Dīn and Mu'izz al-Dīn were buried at Malikpūr: Firūz Shāh, *Furūḡ-i Firūz-Shāhī*, ed. Shaikh Abdur Rashid (Aligarh: Aligarh Muslim University Press, 1954), p. 13, and trans. N.B. Roy, "The Victories of Sultān Firūz Shāh of the Tughluq Dynasty," *Islamic Culture* 15 (1941): 460.

65. There seems to be a parallel with the grave of Ilutmish's rival Tāj al-Dīn Yildiz at Badā'ūn, which had become a focus of pilgrimage by the time Jūzjānī wrote. See Jūzjānī, vol. 1, p. 413 (trans. Raverty, vol. 1, p. 506). Here again we have a monarch to whose overthrow the regime at Delhi was indebted for its very survival, but whose memory—in this case as the senior *ghulām* of Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Sām, the Ghūrid conqueror of northern India, and later the bulwark of Muslim India against the Khwārazmshāh—commanded reverence. For Yildiz as the opponent of the Khwārazmshāh, see Peter Jackson, "The Fall of the Ghurid Dynasty," in *Festschrift for Professor C.E. Bosworth* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, forthcoming).

66. See Schregle, p. 143.